DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION/Strategic Stockpile Sales to Offset Fee Waiver

SUBJECT: National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997 . . . S. 1745. Cohen modified amendment No. 4369.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 74-18

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1745, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997, will authorize a total of \$267.3 billion in budget authority for national defense programs (the President requested \$254.3 billion). In real terms, this bill will authorize \$5.6 billion less, and the President requested \$18.6 billion less, than was provided in fiscal year (FY) 1996.

The Cohen modified amendment would provide for the sale of specified amounts of certain minerals from the National Defense Stockpile through September 30, 2005. Those sales would be to offset the cost of waiving the recoupment fee for certain sales under the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) program. Sales would be conducted so as not to harm the domestic industries that produce those strategic minerals. As modified, the amendment would sell titanium sponge only to the extent that the sale of the other minerals did not produce enough funds to offset the cost of waiving recoupment fees. (By law, United States companies that sell defense equipment abroad through the FMS program are charged a fee by the Defense Department if that equipment was developed in part by the Defense Department. The Federal Government acts as a middleman in FMS sales. Last year's defense authorization bill, contingent upon the enactment of offsets, gave the President the authority to waive recoupment fees in two cases. First, he could waive a fee if failure to do so would result in a loss of the sale. Second, he could waive a fee for a sale of a defense item if doing so would result in lower unit costs for the Defense Department's purchases of that item.)

Those favoring the amendment contended:

Last year, the President, contingent upon the enactment of offsets, was given authority to waive FMS recoupment fees for defense equipment sales in two specific cases. First, he was given authority to waive fees in those cases in which failing to do so would result in the sales being lost. A fee obviously could not be collected if a sale were not made. Second, he was given authority to waive fees in those cases in which the United States would substantially offset the revenue loss by gaining unit cost savings on its purchases

(See other side)

	YEAS (74)	NAYS (18)		NOT VOTING (8)		
	Republicans	Democrats	Republicans	Democrats	Republicans	Democrats
	(47 or 96%)	(27 or 63%)	(2 or 4%)	(16 or 37%)	(4)	(4)
Abraham Ashcroft Bennett Bond Burns Campbell Coats Cohen Coverdell Craig D'Amato DeWine Domenici Faircloth Frahm Frist Gorton Gramm Gramm Grassley Gregg Hatch Helms	Hutchison Jeffords Kassebaum Kempthorne Kyl Lott Lugar Mack McConnell Murkowski Nickles Pressler Roth Santorum Shelby Simpson Smith Snowe Specter Stevens Thomas Thompson Thurmond Warner	Baucus Biden Breaux Bryan Byrd Conrad Daschle Dodd Ford Heflin Hollings Inouye Johnston Kerrey Kerry Kohl Levin Lieberman Mikulski Moseley-Braun Moynihan Murray Nunn Pell Reid Robb Rockefeller	Brown McCain	Akaka Bingaman Boxer Bradley Dorgan Feingold Glenn Graham Harkin Kennedy Lautenberg Leahy Sarbanes Simon Wellstone Wyden	1—Offic 2—Nece 3—Illne 4—Othe SYMBO AY—Ai	r LS: nnounced Yea nnounced Nay ired Yea

VOTE NO. 180 JUNE 27, 1996

of the items for which it waived fees. For instance, if the United States needed 10 items of a particular defense system, and another country wanted 100, allowing the sale of 100 to go forward would result in economies of scale that would make the 10 items purchased by the Government much cheaper. Though this waiver authority was enacted last year, it has not been put into effect because no offsets have been enacted yet to pay for its net cost. This year, the Administration has proposed specific sales of minerals from the strategic stockpile in order to provide the needed offsets, and has threatened to veto this bill if its proposal is not accepted. The Cohen amendment would simply accept the President's proposal. The only objections to this amendment of which we are aware are that it might result in unfriendly countries buying state-of-the-art U.S. defense technology and that it might depress the markets for the minerals that would be sold (thereby harming the domestic industries that produce those minerals). The first objection is baseless, because the amendment would only apply to FMS sales, which must be individually approved by the Government. The second objection is addressed in the amendment, first with a provision that would forbid the President to proceed with a sale of a mineral if it would hurt a domestic industry producing that mineral, and second with a provision providing special protection to titanium sponge producers. This second provision was added as a modification, and we believe that as a result most Senators are now willing to support the Cohen amendment. We urge Senators to join us in voting in favor of the amendment.

No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.